App F IX 4

Previous References

Permanent

1932 (M) — 1934

File No 165-32

Serial Nos 1–2

Later References

PRESERVED

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos 2

Part B for December 1932

SUBJECT

Lighting contract in the Alur Municipality for 1932-33

---

2 The DC Hassan

L 4349 Dy 27-12-32

States that no action as proposed by them is called for

Lighting Contract — Alwar Govt

[App F III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | Govt File No 165 of 1932 1686

Serial No

1 Letter no P R 13-32 of 23-9-32 from the Dy, Ajmer drawing to notice the irregularity that Alwar Govt in the disposal of the lighting contracts in the Govt and depending in the event that the rules may be directed to strictly adhere to the established rules and not to come room for lapses in future

---

The Dy Comr's letter explains the facts of the case under ref to (1) the Govt Regn, the Govts are empowered to enter into contracts necessary for the carrying out the purposes of the Regn ~~No interference with [illegible] in any matter relating to the Regn by the Govt or the Govt may be changed or otherwise~~

Further reply

D/W 4/10 Whether any instructions to be issued in the manner proposed by the Govt are necessary as a matter for orders

D 6/10/32 What are the rules referred to in the last para of the Dy Comrs letter Please send if any

8/10

No specific rules have been framed for the disposal of the lighting contract in the Govts the Govt Comr appears to refer

NOTE—Contn Sheet

2485/32

Re Sterling contracts — P Alex, Camps

Ind File No 165 of 1932 | General and Revenue 1466 Secretariat

Rules framed for the disposal of contracts

2nd 3/ 4/5/10

The Sale notification mentioned that the sale was subject to the decision of the Municipal Council, ~~regarding the confirmation that the Council was to pass~~ and in coming to a decision the PLC have considered the ~~only~~ subsequent offers made and finally decided in favour of the sale purchase for reasons mentioned in para 5 of the Dis letter.

GENERAL SECTT. 15 OCT 19 No

There seems to be no necessity to reopen the matter or to issue any instruction to the PL Council as suggested by the DC

for orders

(Govt Secy) 13/10

~~A Draft copy to the Dy Com~~

For favor of ~~orders~~ remarks on the procedure adopted by the PLC in this case

(Govt Secy Lawsons and Camps) 7/11

There seem to be no question of law involved in this Case the ~~paper~~ file may be returned for disposal on merits of facts

ISD 16/1

There is no question of law involved on the facts as appear from the records There seems to be no irregularity in the procedure adopted by the M Council

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 1456a of 193

Serial No

acceptance of the
according to the conditions. The bid is subject
to the approval of the Council. The object of
this is that the Council may have an opportunity
of considering all the qualifications of bidders
& accept the best bid from all points of view
& not necessarily the best from the point of view
of the money value of the bid as in the case of
an outright auction. The Council in this
case accepted the best bid. They were not
bound to consider the applications received
subsequently. But if they chose, they could
have held another auction in view of the
subsequent lower tenders. It is not clear
if there are any rules governing the sale
procedure. The DC states that the sale
need not be reopened. If the Council have
violated any established rules as stated by
the DC, the Council may be informed
about it.

(Chief Secretary) C 28/11/37

GENERAL SECRETARY
29 NOV 1937
No

No action is called for.
The remarks may be noted by the DC
Ltn 6/12

37/3a
6/12

T Rendel
A 9/12

J.P.K.

4/12

Ltn 12/12

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 70—GBPM—60 000—13 & 31

Lighting Contract — Alterations

2nd File No 165 of 193 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

19 DEC

GENL & REV

2

B

ML 165-32-1

TEL ADDRES : DEPCOM HASSAN

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District
Dated Hassan the 23rd September 32

N LY L E F TO
No F R 13-32
ENCL 1 Rs

1486

FROM

G B HEBLIKAR Esq LL B
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT

REV SECTN
23 SEP 1932

TO

R Ranga Rao, Esq , B A , B L ,
General Secretary to Government,
B a n g a l o r e

GENERAL SECRETARY
26 SEP
No 6 88

SIR

In forwarding herewith the records received with Alur Municipal President's report No C 15-32, dated 1st September 32, re the disposal of the lighting contract in the Alur Municipality for 32-33, I have the honor to state as follows -

1 The President notified the disposal of the contract for the current year and held the sale on 22nd June 1932, when Mr Pir Sab undertook to take up the contract at Re 1-6-0 per light

2 On 23rd June 1932, one Mokadam Sab presented an application to the President, requesting that the contract may be given to him at Re 1-2-0 per light The President made a note on this petition to the effect that it may be placed before the Council at their meeting fixed for 30th June 1932 On 30th June 1932, i e on the day of the meeting, one Nabi Sab gave another ~~petition~~ application, offering Re 0-15-0 per light

3 At the meeting held on 30th June 1932, the Council resolved that "The petitions of Mokadam Sab and Nabi Sab were read, that though they have offered lower rates, since they were present at the sale, but did not bid, and since the sale purchaser (Pir Sab has been doing his work satisfactorily from a long time, the sale already held may be confirmed"

4 On 2nd July 1932, Mokadam Sab presented a stamped petition

to this office, saying that he was not in the town on the date of sale and requesting that the contract may be given to him at Re 1-2-0 per light

5 A report having been called for from the President, he reported "that the sale was held openly at the shandy maidan, after due publication that the petitioner could have bid at the sale, that the Council, after careful consideration of all the aspects came to the conclusion that the offer now accepted was most acceptable, considering how he did business in the years previous"

I wish to bring to the notice of Government that by accepting the offer of Mr Pir Sab, at Re 1-6-0 per light, the Council have sustained loss There were 2 offers one at Re 1-2-0 and another at Rs 0-15-0 per light, and both these offers had been received before the sale had been confirmed by the Council There was no provision in the sale Isthihar, reserving the discretion to accept or reject the bids received In view of this defect in the Sale Isthihar, and since the offers of Mokadam Sab and Nabi Sab had been received before the sale had been confirmed, I think the Council should have taken the probable loss they would sustain by confirming the sale in favour of Mr Peer Sab, and resolved to hold a resale The only ground alleged is that the applicants were present at the sale, but did not bid But the President does not say in his report that the petitioners were present at the sale

It is not perhaps desirable at this stage to reopen the question but I request you to be so good as to move the Government to kindly direct the Municipal Council to strictly adhere to established rules and not give room for such vagaries in future

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

i

Section nil

File No 165—32

Serial No 2

Diary No of letter replied to 1486

No L 4349

To The Dr, Hamm Dl

Sir,

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 17/12/32

Signed by for A S Ray

I am directed to state that no

List of enclosures

Copied by 29/12/32

Examined by

WD 71—GBPM—40 000—20 7 31

15/14/12

d 4249
Rd 165-32-2

20th December 1932

The

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District

In returning herewith the records relating to the disposal of the lighting contract in the Alur municipality for 1932-33 received with your letter No F 13-32 dated 23rd September 1932 I am directed to state that no action as proposed by you is called for

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government

(2